*				
Mit_ite	Order	Form	(06/97)	

et Northorn District of Illinois

or Magistrate Judge		mes B. Moran	Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge			
		01 C 1757	DATE	5/10/20	001	
		Divisio	Division Sales, Inc. Vs. Kmart Corporation			
моті	ION:	[In the following nature of the n	ng box (a) indicate the party notion being presented.]	filing the motion, e.g., plaintiff, de	efendant, 3rd party plaintiff,	and (b) state briefly the
			Memorandur	n Opinion and Order		
DOCI	KET ENTR	Y:				
(1)	□ P	filed motion of [u	se listing in "Motion" be	ox above.]		
(2)			motion due			
(3)		Answer brief to mo	tion due Reply	to answer brief due		
(4)		Ruling/Hearing on set for at				
(5)		Status hearing[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at				
(6)		Pretrial conference[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at				
(7)		Trial[set for/re-set for] on at				
(8)	•	[Bench/Jury trial] [Hearing] held/continued toat				
(9)	1	This case is dismissed [with/without] prejudice and without costs[by/agreement/pursuant to] ☐ FRCP4(m) ☐ General Rule 21 ☐ FRCP41(a)(1) ☐ FRCP41(a)(2).				
(10)	transfer	, based upon a n	nandatory forum sel-	ndum Opinion and Orde ection provision in the P Eastern District of Mich	urchase Order Term	to dismiss or as and Conditio
(11)		[For further detail	see order attached to th	e original minute order.]		
	No notices rec	quired, advised in open	court.			Document Number
	No notices rec	-			number of notices	
Notices mailed by judge's staff. Notified counsel by telephone.				MAY 1 4 2001		
✓ 	Docketing to Mail A 450 fo	mail notices.	FILED	ED-7 FOR DOCKETING	docketing deputy initials	
	WAH	courtroom deputy's initials		Y 11 PM12: 04	date mailed notice	
i				entral Clerk's Office	mailing deputy initials	

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

DIVISION SALES, INC.,	
Plaintiff,)	
vs.	No. 01 C 1757
KMART CORPORATION,	
Defendant.)	"AY I TO TO

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Plaintiff brought this contract claim against defendant in state court and defendant removed. Defendant then moved to dismiss or to transfer, based upon a mandatory forum selection provision in the Purchase Order Terms and Conditions Agreement. Plaintiff earlier indicated an intention to oppose the motion, but it has filed nothing in opposition. And it is evident why no opposition has been filed. Forum selection clauses are presumptively valid, and they are to be followed unless enforcement would be unreasonable or unjust or the provision was procured by fraud or overreaching. There is nothing here to suggest that the provision here is anything more or less than it purports to be – a forum selection clause insisted upon by one party to a commercial relationship as a condition of doing business with the other. This case is transferred to the Eastern District of Michigan.

May 10, 2001.

· ----

JAMES B. MORAN
Serior Judge, U. S. District Court